

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000100070015-4

DD/S 72-2869

21 JUL 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Communications  
Director of Finance  
Director of Logistics  
Director of Medical Services  
Director of Personnel  
✓ Director of Security  
Director of Training  
Chief, Support Services Staff

25X1C

SUBJECT : Program Evaluation

1. The Director is particularly concerned as to the interrelationship between motivation of our personnel and productivity of their efforts, and the degree to which evaluations can contribute to maintaining these at a high level. The Director has charged the Deputies with examining the actual status of their evaluation systems in their Directorates.
2. The Inspector General has been directed to perform the staff supervision of the assembly of a study of the actual status of evaluation systems in the Directorates. The Support Directorate's response to the IG on program evaluation is due on 20 September 1972. Your response should be submitted to the Chief, DD/S Plans Staff by 1 September 1972.
3. Centralized program evaluation, in any form, has often been viewed as undesirable, if not impossible. A new set of pressures, however, is calling these assumptions into question. The pressures for change are both external and internal. The people who allocate resources -- both in OMB and the Congress -- will not be satisfied much longer with the kind of program defenses we have offered in the past. The new people in OMB and the Congress (young senators and their staffs, new OMB budget examiners, systems analysts, etc.) continue to chip away. In addition to such external pressure, there is growing internal pressure for change. Data generated from systematic program evaluation is needed by Agency managers to enable them to know how Agency components are performing in relation to each other and to Agency goals.

CLASSIFIED BY 6377-10-112277

SUBJECT TO FEDERAL INFORMATION ACT SCHEDULE  
OF E. O. 11652. AUTOMATICALLY DOWNGRADED AT  
TWO YEAR INTERVALS AND DECLASSIFIED ON

1975

(Insert date or event)

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000100070015-4

4. In an informal and unstructured sense, all managers evaluate their program activities during the decision-making process. Hopefully, formal program evaluation will raise questions in our minds about our own programs. This impetus for questioning and rethinking past decisions would probably be the primary advantage of more systematic program evaluations. Formal evaluation might allow us to ask the right questions about our program activities.

5. We all had a little exposure to the subject of program evaluation in the Critique of the FY 1973 Office Program Submissions sent to you last Fall. As government managers, I am sure we have all read about program evaluation in pertinent current literature on the subject. Even more recently, we had exposure through the priority and performance evaluations we assigned to each FAN account in the FY 1974 Program Submissions.

6. I would like each of you to respond to the following questions on program evaluation:

- What goals (or significant objectives) have you set against which you can measure (evaluate) program performance?
- How do you evaluate your degree of success in achieving your program goals?
- Please provide an inventory of your programs which you have subjected to performance evaluation in the past fiscal year.
- How do you utilize evaluation systems (of any kind) in programmatic, personnel or other decision-making?
- Please provide a critique of your current evaluation system(s) and gaps in these systems.
- Are your evaluation systems planned and designed with the decision-making function in mind?
- What are your suggestions on program performance evaluation system(s) for the Agency? For the Directorate?

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000100070015-4

-3-

7. I believe it is evident that some common themes are developing; i.e., from the type of questions asked above regarding program evaluation, from the response requested in the Agency Annual Report, from the Annual Management Report required by OMB Circular A-44 (Revised), and the response requested by O/PPB for preparation of Planning Guidance, FY 1975-FY 1979.

8. Because of the impact a generalized program evaluation system will have on the Agency and the Support Directorate in future years, I urge the command level in each Office to become personally involved in preparing the response to questions asked above.



Robert S. Wattles  
Acting Deputy Director  
for Support

25X1A

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000100070015-4

EYES ONLY

MEMORANDUM FOR : All Deputy Directors and Staff Chiefs

SUBJECT : Internal Management Review of the  
Office of Security

PURPOSE : Review and designate by order of  
priority OS activities in consonance  
with approved OS organization,  
mission and functions as prescribed  
in [REDACTED]

STATINTL

OBJECTIVE : To meet potential personnel and  
budgetary limitations by end of  
FY 1974 and subsequent fiscal  
year operations.

SCOPE OF REVIEW : Study the overall organization and  
the need for current manning re-  
quirements, i. e., determine  
balance between professional vs.  
clerical positions; necessity for  
deputies; contract vs. staff  
positions; consolidation of  
secretarial requirements to  
include, if required, reserve  
secretarial backup; consolidation  
of related organizational components;  
SOP's; documentation processing  
and handling; and, other related  
items. (Suggest additional matters  
be included as result of initial  
discussion.)

EYES ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

EYES ONLY

FREQUENCY OF REVIEW: Initial meeting scheduled for 1000 hours, 8 August 1972, followed by additional meetings to complete initial review. Subsequent meetings will be held semi-annually during each fiscal year to determine if shift in OS priorities should be made to meet current or future personnel ceiling or budgetary limitations.

APPROVING OFFICER : Director and Deputy Director, Office of Security will be briefed upon completion of each review and final approval of overall priorities will be granted by the Director of Security.

LOCATION : The initial review will be held in the Office of Security conference room. Subsequent meetings, including semi-annual reviews for purposes of analyzing OS overall activities, will be held at [REDACTED] for approximately two (2) days and will include presentation and review of OS priority objectives to the Director and Deputy Director of Security and final approval by the Director of Security.

STATINTL

EYES ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY